

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated September 7, 2006. All rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner required election of either Invention I or Invention II. Applicant hereby elects Invention I, and claims 1-23 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or dedication.

At paragraphs 4-11, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 9-13, 16 and 20-23 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of published United States patent application 2002/0136038 of Spitaels et al. ("Spitaels et al.") and United States patent 6,131,125 of Rostoker et al. ("Rostoker et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Spitaels et al. discloses an uninterruptible power supply having a multipurpose data port that facilitates a plurality of communication methods between the uninterruptible power supply and a host computer system. The multipurpose data port of Spitaels et al. is configured to prevent interference if a user mistakenly connects a phone line or other similar but inappropriate line to the uninterruptible power supply.

Figure 2 of Spitaels et al. shows a UPS 10 configured to communicate with a host computer 30 through a set of communication ports 32,34,36 in the UPS 10. The host computer 30 and a controller 16 contained in the UPS 10 are configured to communicate with each other, such that the controller 16 contained in the UPS 10 provides operating status, data saving and other instructions and information to the host computer 30 through a set of cables 42,44,46 connected between communication ports 32,34,36 of the UPS 30 and the host computer 30. The

host computer 30 of Spitacls et al. may also be configured to convey various parameters and commands to the controller 16 via cables 42,44,46.

Spitacls et al. further teach that a cable 50 in Figure 5 preferably includes an RJ-45 plug on one end for connecting to a 10 position RJ-45 jack 80. The cable 50 of Spitacls et al. is described as potentially including any of a number of plugs or other connection means on the other end for connecting with host computer 30, including a USB plug, a DB-9 plug, a DB-25 plug, an adapter for connecting to different types of jacks, a multi-headed connection or other compatible connector, depending upon the type of jack or port the cable 50 is connecting to on the host computer 30 or other external device.

Rostoker et al. disclose a protocol translation cable assembly including translation circuitry coupled to at least some of a plurality of wires of the cable at points between pins of a first connector and pins of a second connector. The Rostoker et al. cable assembly provides "plug-and-play" capabilities where the cable communicates with a first communication protocol at a first end, and a second communication protocol at the second end, for example through translation between USB communication protocol at one end and Ethernet communication protocol at the other end of the cable. To this end, Rostoker et al. disclose in Figures 3A and 3B a translation circuitry 64 supported by a PC board or substrate 68 having conductive "traces" connected to various components of a translation circuitry 64, and further show a first protocol translator 70, a second protocol translator 72, and a number of other integrated circuits or small devices 74, and a plastic connector 78 is coupled to USB related pins, and a second plastic connector coupled to an Ethernet side of the cable. Rostoker et al. further teach that the translation circuitry of the Rostoker et al. system can be enclosed within one of the end connectors of a cable assembly.

Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. fails to disclose or suggest any method or system for connecting a device to a central system that includes:

detecting the insertion of a *cable connector* into a slot in said central system, *wherein said cable connector is integral to a cable that is terminated by said cable connector, wherein said cable is communicably connected to said device at an opposite end of a cable from said cable connector;*

reading, through said slot, configuration information stored in a memory contained *within said cable connector;* and

configuring said central system in response to said configuration information read from said memory contained *within said cable connector.* (emphasis added)

As in the present independent claims 1, 12 and 23. In contrast, Spitaels et al. teach a system in which a controller contained within an external device provides information to a host device through a number of separate cables, and Rostoker et al. teach a cable that provides communication protocol translation. Accordingly, the combination of Spitaels et al. with Rostoker et al. results in a system that provides information from a controller in an external device to a host device through a protocol translating cable. Such an approach stands in distinct contrast to the features of the present independent claims 1, 12 and 23, which set forth reading configuration from a *cable connector* that is *integral to a cable terminated by the cable connector*, where *the cable is connected to an external device at an opposite end of the cable from the cable connector.*

This distinction of the present independent claims over the combined references is apparent from the illustrations in Spitaels et al., which show conventional cables labeled 42, 44 and 46 in Figure 2, and labeled 50 in Figure 3. The description of translation logic of Rostoker et al. teaches protocol translation operation that is transparent to the devices interconnected by the Rostoker et al. cable assembly (see column 7, lines 18-24). Moreover, rather than teaching even

the possibility of providing configuration information to an attached device, Rostoker et al. instead teach downloading new instructions and/or communication protocols *from* an apparatus to which the Rostoker et al. cable is connected into the Rostoker et al. translation circuit in lines 53-67 of column 6.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to claims 1, 12 and 23. As to claims 2, 5, 9-11, 13, 16 and 20-22, they each depend from claims 1 and 12, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. for at least the same reasons.

At paragraphs 12-18 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al., and additionally citing United States patent number 6,081,782 of Rabin ("Rabin").

As discussed above, Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. fail to disclose or suggest reading configuration from a *cable connector* that is *integral to a cable terminated by the cable connector*, where *the cable is connected to an external device at an opposite end of the cable from the cable connector*, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12. This shortcoming of the combination of Spitaels et al. and Rostoker et al. is not remedied by further combination with the teachings of Rabin, which include a description of a database to store speech models and other user information in column 4. Accordingly, the combination of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin also fails to disclose or suggest reading configuration from a *cable connector* that is *integral to a cable terminated by the cable connector*, where *the cable is connected to an*

external device at an opposite end of the cable from the cable connector, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12, from which claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 depend.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combined teachings of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin fail to disclose all the features of the present independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, the combination of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claims 1 and 12, and dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 6, 2007
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131